

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
8 AT SEATTLE

9 SUSAN EILEEN BLANCHARD,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 RONDA WRIGHT, *et al.*,

13 Defendants.  
14

Case No. C18-1265RSL

ORDER DENYING MOTION  
FOR TEMPORARY  
RESTRAINING ORDER

15 This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff's "Motion for TRO." Dkt. # 5. In  
16 considering a motion for a temporary restraining order, the Court weighs plaintiff's likelihood of  
17 success on the merits, the likelihood of irreparable injury, the balance of hardships, and the  
18 public interest. See Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc., 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008). The first factor  
19 is the most important, and a party seeking preliminary relief will not succeed without showing a  
20 likelihood of success on the merits. Garcia v. Google, Inc., 786 F.3d 733, 740 (9th Cir. 2015).  
21 Plaintiff's motion is a single page with no details about the merits of her case. See Dkt. # 5. As  
22 for her complaint, Dkt. # 4, it is difficult to discern the basis for it and it is not at all apparent she  
23 is likely to succeed on the merits. For these reasons, her motion, Dkt. # 5, is DENIED.

24 DATED this 30th day of August, 2018.  
25

26   
27

Robert S. Lasnik

United States District Judge  
28